

From the diary of
comrade M.M. Litvinov

Extract from the Record of the Talk with
SHIGEMITSU
August 31, 1938

SHIGEMITSU stated that the Japanese party has no objections to setting the treaties concluded by the representatives of China and Russia as principle of the work, but the Japanese party understands that additional documents may be submitted to the committee, and they will be considered by the committee, to make its work more successful.

SHIGEMITSU said that on the whole he had no objections to leaving point 4 in the version of the Soviet party. But as to the additional documents, of which he spoke, he thought there were no objections to using them.

I stressed this only as an argument. Whether the committee would accept them or not, is for the committee to decide. SHIGEMITSU repeated that he has no objections to leaving the contents of the point 4 in its present version, but speaking of the submission of the additional documents he repeated that he meant what I said to him last time and that which results from the contents of today's talk. Thus he, SHIGEMITSU, thought that both parties understand this point in the same way.

I replied to this: "Let us hope that both parties understand this point in the same way."

Here I added that to make it clearer I would make this point more precise. The Hunchun agreement and other documents signed by the representatives of Russia and China should be necessarily considered by the committee. The Japanese and Manchurian party cannot say: "We cannot accept this or that treaty." As to the other documents submitted by one of the parties, the opposite party may say that she does not accept this or that document. In this lies the difference between the nature of the agreements signed by the representatives of Russia and China and other documents. I think I made myself clear and the Ambassador probably understood me.

SHIGEMITSU answered that he understood it in the following way: The treaties and agreements concluded between Russia and China are set up as principle of the committee work, and other additional documents are taken into consideration—this is for the committee to decide in what manner to take them into consideration. Considering all that he stated that we had no differences.

The extract is correct:

Chief of the State Central Historic Record Office of the USSR

Professor

V. Maksakov

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Lt. Colonel Taranenko, G. I., a member of the military forces of the U.S.S.R., do hereby certify that extract from the record of the talk between Litvinov and Shigemitsu on August 31, 1938 in Moscow on 2 sheets was delivered to me by the Central State Historical Record Office of the USSR on or about March 13, 1946, and that the original of the said document may be found in the Central State Historical Records Office in Moscow.

I do further certify

Lt. Col. TARAENKO /s/
Signature and rank

Tokyo, Japan

June 24, 1946.